

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated September 7, 2005. Claims 30 to 69 are pending in the application, of which Claims 30, 35, 40, 45, 50, 55, 60, 65, 68 and 69 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

As an initial matter, Applicant's undersigned attorney thanks the Examiner for acknowledgment of the Claim To Priority in grandparent Application No. 08/786,992.

Claims 68 and 69 were objected to for various informalities. It is believed that the foregoing amendments to these claims renders moot this objection, and removal thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 30 to 69 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 of parent U.S. Patent No. 6,210,051 (Sakurai). Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Applicant notes that Claim 1 of Sakurai is directed to an information processing apparatus connected to a device via a cable, comprising: a detecting unit adapted to detect whether or not the cable is connected to the information processing apparatus; an obtaining unit disposed such that when said detecting unit detects that the cable is connected to the information processing apparatus, said obtaining unit obtains a device ID of a device connected to a second end of the cable; a first discriminating unit disposed such that when the obtaining unit obtained the device ID via the cable, said first discriminating unit discriminates whether or not a device driver being activated in the information processing apparatus at the present time is able to control the device on the basis of the obtained device ID; and a warning unit disposed such that

when said first discriminating unit discriminates that the device driver is not able to control the device, said warning unit warns that the device driver is not able to control the device.

However, Claim 30 of the present application is directed to an information processing apparatus which communicates with a device via a communication medium, comprising: a detecting unit adapted to detect the device; an obtaining unit adapted to obtain a device ID from the device in response to a detection of the device, **wherein an optional device is connected to the device and wherein the device ID is determined depending on a connection status of the optional unit to the device**; a discriminating unit adapted to discriminate whether or not a device driver for controlling the device corresponding to the obtained device ID is installed; and a warning unit adapted to warn when said discriminating unit discriminates that the device driver corresponding to the obtained device ID is not installed in the information processing apparatus. (Emphasis added.)

Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to the emphasized feature of Claim 30 wherein an optional device is connected to a device. In Claim 30, the device's ID is determined by the connection status of the device to the optional device. Such a feature is not present in Claim 1 of Sakurai. Furthermore, the Office Action fails to supply sufficient reasoning to establish that the feature of the connection status of the optional unit being used to determine the device ID is obvious over Claim 1 of Sakurai. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 30 to 69 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,365,311 (Matsuoka) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,748,980 (Lipe). Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

The present invention concerns an information processing apparatus obtaining a device ID from a device such as a peripheral device and performing a certain operation based on the device ID such as discriminating whether a device driver is installed, discriminating whether the device can be supported and so on. In particular, an optional device, for example an ADF, a both side printing unit and so on, is connected to the device and the device ID is determined depending on a connection status of the optional unit to the device.

Therefore, the present invention features installing in an information apparatus, a device driver corresponding to the device ID which is determined depending on a connection status of the optional device to the peripheral device. Particularly, the obtaining unit adapted to obtain the device ID is included in the information processing apparatus where the device driver corresponding to the device ID is to be installed.

Turning to specific claim language, previously presented independent Claim 30 is directed to an information processing apparatus which communicates with a device via a communication medium. The information processing apparatus includes a detecting unit adapted to detect the device and an obtaining unit adapted to obtain a device ID from the device in response to a detection of the device, wherein an optional device is connected to the device and wherein the device ID is determined depending on a connection status of the optional unit to the device. The apparatus further includes a discriminating unit adapted to discriminate whether or not a device driver for controlling the device corresponding to the obtained device ID is installed and a warning unit adapted to warn when said discriminating unit discriminates that the device driver corresponding to the obtained device ID is not installed in the information processing apparatus.

In contrast, Matsuoka, discloses an image forming device and not an information processing apparatus where a device driver is to be installed. The image forming device of Matsuoka includes an engine controller 43 which can determine connection conditions for a plurality of option devices based on a status and ID information returned from the option devices in response to requesting commands.

Furthermore, Lipe discloses receiving a device ID from a printer to select and install a device driver as shown in Fig.5A and B. Referring to lines 4 to 48, column 15, of Lipe, it is described that setting information of the printer is stored in a registry.

However, neither Matsuoka nor Lipe, neither alone nor in combination, disclose nor suggest an information apparatus which includes an installed a device driver and obtains a device ID which is determined depending on a connection status of the optional device to the device. In addition, neither Matsuoka nor Lipe disclose nor suggest discriminating whether or not a device driver, corresponding to the device ID which varies according to the connection status of the optional device to the device, is installed in the information processing apparatus.

In light of the deficiencies of Matsuoka nor Lipe as discussed above, Applicant submits that independent Claim 30 is now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.


Independent Claims 35, 40, 45, 50, 55, 60, 65, 68 and 69 incorporate substantially the same features as independent Claim 30. Applicant submits that the discussion above in regard to Claim 30 applies equally to Claims 35, 40, 45, 50, 55, 60, 65, 68 and 69. Therefore, Applicant submits that Claims 35, 40, 45, 50, 55, 60, 65, 68 and 69 are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

The other pending claims in this application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed allowable for at least the same reasons. However, as each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual consideration of each dependent claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Based on the foregoing amendment and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Frank L. Cire', written over a horizontal line.

Frank L. Cire
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 42,419

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 105924v1